THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVIII APRIL, 1943 NO. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

Humanism in Shakspere's Works ..... *Prof. M. M. Morozov* 51

Teaching the Shaksperian Drama ..... *Clyde F. Lyttle* 62

Shakspere's Stage Business ..... *Samuel A. Small* 66

Magic—Of An Age and For All Time ..... *Claire McGlinchee* 72

Shakspere And *Sir Thomas Moore* ..... *Paul Deutschberger* 75

Much Ado About Something ..... *George C. Taylor* 92

Editorial Comment—An Important New Book ..... *S. A. T.* 95

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/shakespeare-association-bulletin_1943-04_18_2

HUMANISM IN SHAKSPERE'S WORKS*

By Professor M. M. Morozov

TODAY we are opening our fourth Shakspere conference. The first occurred in 1939. We were then discussing the achievements of the past, the milestones left behind by the Soviet theater in producing Shakspere. The conference of 1940 was devoted to the problems of translating Shakspere into Russian; and that of last year pointed out the perspectives of the future Soviet theater in producing Shakspere.

At this conference we speak of the present, of the connection between Shakspere's genius and the world of today. We feel that the great humanist is with us in this titanic struggle against fascist man-haters. But having accepted Shakspere as our contemporary, we must study him for the future as well. Perhaps today we may be able to see more clearly those fundamental matters in Shakspere's works which will later serve us as guiding stars in the practical and creative work of our theaters. This is why I chose for my subject today Shakspere's humanism. Shakspere's genius not only produced a galaxy of remarkable characters, his works are a plea for humanism. No matter what attitude or point of view we take in approaching his works, we invariably find in them the humanitarian attitude.

An attentive reader of Shakspere will note that two concepts, two basic themes, are constantly repeated by him—"cloak and nature" (appearance and reality). These ideas or themes are always placed in juxtaposition. Even in his youthful comedy, *The Taming of the Shrew,* it is easy to see these clearly identified themes in the characters of Katherine and Bianca.

Katherine is a self-willed shrew. But this is not her nature. It is her fancy, her exterior, her humor — her "cloak". As the play progresses she throws off this exterior and emerges as a tender, yielding character—the shrewish cloak is off.

Alongside of Katherine her sister Bianca is vivacious, sympathetic, good. But, the marriage is hardly over when

*A speech delivered at the Shakspere Conference in Moscow in April, 1942. Translated by Eugene Blum.

she shows her claws and calls her husband a fool in the presence of others. Her gentleness and modesty were only the cloak which concealed a different nature. This is an earlier work but even here Shakspere points to the difference between "cloak and substance" in the contrast between Katherine and Bianca. It is interesting that in the original of this play (not by Shakspere) Bianca is absent. Shakspere introduces her to underline the contradiction. This point is also brought out in Petruchio's monologue when he says:

> "What! is the jay more precious than the lark
> Because his feathers are more beautiful?
> Or is the adder better than the eel
> Because his painted skin contents the eye?"

This point has not been sufficiently emphasized in our productions of *The Taming*. Even the excellent staging in the theater of the Red Army omitted this monologue, so important in the conception of the play. This applies to the entire symbolism of the comedy. We must go deeper into Shakspere's symbolism. Why does Petruchio take away Katherine's gorgeous raiment? Because this brings out the basic idea of the play: the cloak and the substance. Why does Petruchio appear in rags at his wedding? Because Katherine is marrying him, not his clothes. Shakspere's works are rich in this kind of symbolism, even though, to our regret, it is being overlooked even in the best of our productions.

If we follow Shakspere in the development of this theme carefully, we will discover that the same idea is carried over to the social plane. Nobility, for instance, is just a matter of clothes. In *The Winter's Tale,* for instance, when, at the end of the fifth act, the shepherd and his simple son (the clown) become gentlemen, they insist that their children will be "gentlemen born". Says the clown:

> "See you these clothes? Say you see them not,
> and think me still no gentleman born."

But the basic development of the theme "nature *verus* cloak", as we call it, received its ultimate expression in the tragedies, above all in the clash between black Othello and "honest" Iago. Roderigo calls Othello thick-lipped. Brabantio is not only indignant, he is amazed, that Desdemona could choosse as her husband such a "vile thing".

According to Shakspere's plot, Othello is not handsome. Desdemona says: "I saw Othello's visage in his mind." But Desdemona does not apologize for his exterior. The crux of the matter is that this black and ugly Othello is a singular man, and the seemingly honest Iago proves to be a scoundrel. And this again is a motif which, in my opinion, has not been stressed sufficiently on the stage. I admire the acting of Ostoozshev in *Othello,* yet, when I see him on the stage, I find him too handsome and interesting and not in agreement with Shakspere's plan.

Observing Iago on the stage, it often becomes obvious that he is a villain, yet no one about him notices it. This is revealed gradually by the course of events: the masque falls, down come the cloaks and the nature of man stands revealed.

A book written by Delia Bacon, which denies Shakspere's authorship of the plays, contains a strikingly deep observation about the inner substance of Shakspere's works. Discussing the major tragedies, Miss Bacon calls them "philosophic strippings." King Lear sheds his royal vestments—the Olympian descends upon the earth. He comes down to earth. What a miserable creature the naked two legged animal is! This terrible fall is at the same time a grand triumph. The king is reborn into a man. His clothes are off, his human nature is revealed. Here again we see the important theme which has its deep roots in the human soul.

On the philosophic plane too we find the juxtaposition of name and substance. Remarkable in this respect is Juliet's monologue, when she speaks of the rose:

> "What's in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet."

In other words, the importance is not in the name but in the substance. Juliet continues:

> "What is Montague? It is nor hand, nor foot,
> Nor arm, not face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man."

So in *Hamlet,* when the Queen asks:

> "Why seems it so particular with thee?"

Hamlet answers:

> "Seems, madam! 'Nay it is!
> I know not 'seems'."

This basic theme contributes largely to making Shakspere's works what they are: challenging, revealing. Shakspere becomes the accuser. He takes off the masques, tears off the cloaks, and shows us man as he really is, not as he pretends to be. In the light of present events, this challenging power of Shakspere is extremely important, because you and I, who lived through and are going through so much now, have witnessed shocking deeds in a world-tragedy created by the fascists. Think of the peaceful declarations of the monster Hitler? When they turned to bloody practice of fascism, there appeared in our press a comparison between fascism and the two faced Janus. (Incidentally, in *Othello* Iago swears by Janus.)

Shakspere, the revealer, is very dear to us today.

Speaking of Shakspere's humanism, of the positive content of his works, it seems to me extremely important to point out his attitude to man. The name "man," in the Shaksperian sense, is the highest praise he can give to any character.

When Antony says of Brutus, his enemy, "He was a man," the words sound like great commendation. When he is speaking of Hamlet's father, Horatio says to Hamlet:

"I saw him once; he was a goodly king."

Hamlet replies: "He was a man." It is not important that he was a king and a goodly king, but it is important that he was a man.

Shakspere's works of the first period are characterized by absolute faith in the nobility of human nature, and this explains the optimistic trend of these works. Of course, there are deviations from the norm. Villainy exists as a deviation from the norm. Richard III is cursed from childhood by deformity and ugliness. The villain of *Much Ado,* Don John, is an illegitimate child, which puts him into the unusual position. But those are deviations from the norm. Altogether, Shakspere's works of that period represent a festival of human optimism.

In the second period, in the major tragedies, there appears the conflict; the struggle between the humanists and, as they were known in England at the time, the Machiavellians, people who were willing to sacrifice everything for personal

gain. They were quite in evidence during the epoch of "primary accumulation."

Hence the difference in spirit in the works of the second period,—its cleavage, its dualism: on one hand the avowal of man's greatness; on the other disillusionment in man.

> "What a piece of work is man" and
> "Man delights not me,"

says Hamlet in the same monologue.

Rather typical for this period is the conversation of two fisherman in *Pericles*:

> "I marvel how the fishes live in the sea," muses one.
> "Why as men do a-land; the great ones eat the little ones,"

philosophizes the other.

Shakspere, and not he alone, but Marlowe before him, and many of his contemporaries, saw this fearful strife about them, saw what Apemantus, the philosopher in *Timon,* characterizes as a forest inhabited by wild beasts. But the entire problem is this: does Shakspere consider this strife, which he oberves around him, as something eternal, as the essential part of life? Basically, it seems to me, what makes Shakspere's tragedies tragic and not pessimistic is the fact that he considers evil as something transitory. Think of the appalling event in *Romeo and Juliet*: the lovers perish, but the reconciliation of the Montagues and the Capulets takes place, erecting a golden monument to the heroes at the end. Every tragedy of his, every great work, must be accepted as a reflection of his world viewpoint. At the end of his tragedies we invariably find an optimistic attitude: the strife lessens, enlightenment ensues. Even in *King Lear,* despite the horrible events, this optimistic note is expressed in the fact that noble Edgar and Kent ascend to power.

Our theaters do not bring this out. Not only in the provinces, but in the metropolitan centers as well. They omit, for instance, the reconciliation scene in *Romeo and Juliet.* At a performance of *King Lear,* which I saw not long ago in the provinces, the director left out the finale where Edgar and Kent become the rulers of the State.

Dying Hamlet begs Horatio: "Tell my story." He speaks of the future. When A. V. Poliakov played the part last year in a truly remarkable production in Voronezsh (it was given

fifty times to sold-out houses) and uttered these words, his face was illumined and one felt that he was looking far ahead, saw the end of the strife and evil which destroyed him, and made a tremendous impression.

Hamlet himself finds that life is dislocated and that this dislocation must be set right. Thus Hamlet believes in the possibility of rectification. But the Machiavellian Iago thinks strife an eternal necessity. He sees life at all times as a struggle of beasts, as a contest among men. This is his philosophy, which he exposes in detail before Roderigo. When we analyse the tragedies of Shakspere, we feel how extremely close they are to our times. They are a complete repudiation and denial of all pronouncements and harangues of fascists and Hitler, who insist that life is war and that war is a permanent institution, an eternal part of life. Even when the tragic theme reaches its culmination in *Timon,* where we read that the heart of mankind is made of iron and where Timon exclaims that he is a misanthrope and hates mankind, even here the humanitarian note is not lost, if we recall that the bandit, listening to Timon's tirades, is ready to give up his trade. This is an important detail of the play. Those are not simple monologues of hatred, far from it. Evidently, in their irony, in the satire, there lurks the humanitarian content which converts a criminal into an honest man.

In his last work, *The Tempest,* Shakspere found a way out from the tragic. It seems to me, this play deserves more attention than it has received. To begin with, our translations of it are poor. If it were possible to translate it into Russian in a way that the whole content could be revealed, we would find in it not only an important work, but a play which has a particular meaning in the creative work of the author, as the crowning of his life's work.

In *The Tempest* Shakspere turns into the realm of allegoric art. Prospero, whose name is derived from the verb "to prosper," is the embodiment of prospering humanity; the goal of humanity to come, humanity which has conquered the dark forces of nature, as represented by Caliban, and the bright benign forces, as represented by Ariel. He is the embodiment of mankind, able to read its destiny; mankind able to call up the image of Ceres, at the wave of the magic wand, and receive her gifts of the fruits of the soil.

Miranda says: "How beauteous mankind is." The great contest which Shakspere's genius reflects culminates in the hymn to humanity.

In the same play, through the image of Prospero, the theme of the greatness of human wisdom is developed. Prospero—the sage is the glorification of science and the glorification of human intelligence, the ideals for which civilized man is now warring.

Let us recall, in passing, the scene in *Pericles* where the physician resurrects the dead. This theme in Shakspere's interpretation sounds somewhat naive now, yet it speaks of his profound faith in the intellect, in science. In the play the physician says that science is a greater gift than wealth and noble birth.

Extremely interesting is Shakspere's approach to the problem of destiny. The idea of fate as a mystic concept is totally absent in Shakspere's works. Destiny to him is the sum total of external circumstances or external influences. In this light destiny in *Romeo and Juliet* lies in the strife between the Montagues and the Capulets. Juliet had opportunities to avoid this destiny: had she listened to her nurse and married the handsome Paris, rejecting Romeo, she would have escaped death. But she voluntarily and consciously went her own way. Romeo and Juliet were doomed when they entered the feud in the world of the Montagues and Capulets. Thus the concept of destiny contains nothing mysterious.

Let me direct attention to Macbeth in this connection. Many believed that Macbeth was a pawn in the hands of fate and that he was forced into crime by the witches, the impersonators of fate. But the thought of killing Duncan came to Macbeth long before the "witches" appeared. Says Lady Macbeth to her husband: "What Beast was't then that made you break this enterprize to me?" And again: "Nor time, nor place did then adhere, and yet you would make both." Obviously, they are referring to a time when Macbeth spoke of killing Duncan, a moment which occurred long before he met the weird sisters. The initiative for the crime came from Macbeth, not from them. Macbeth killed Duncan not because they had come into his life; they came because he wanted to kill Duncan.

In this most fatalistic of Shakspere's plays we see that their destiny is being made by the persons themselves. The basic strength of Shakspere's genius lies in this. Shakspere's theory of fate is diametrically opposed to the philosophy of fascists who preach obedience to destiny. This explains their negative attitude to Shakspere: while they accept his comedies as spectacles for entertainment, they reject his more serious works. The philosophy of fate, as expressed by the fascists means that every one must obey blindly and without criticism.

Probing into Shakspere's world-philosophy, we find in every detail of his convictions a direct contradiction to the credo and practice of inhuman fascism. To take just one example: their subjugation of women.

If we should look for any exhibition of this theme in Shakspere, we may find something in his early works; for instance, in *The Comedy of Errors,* in the conversation between Adriana and Luciana, the view is expressed that woman by her nature must be obedient; in *The Taming of the Shrew,* where Katherine in the end appears as a pattern of obedience. This, evidently, was a concession to his epoch, which, beginning with *The Two Gentlemen of Verona,* he later gave up. In his later plays the heroic images of his women revealed themselves more and more. Think of Desdemona. Othello calls her "my fair warrior" when she appears before him in Cyprus. Desdemona is not a faint shadow, as she is often presented on the stage. Shakspere's Desdemona deserts her parents' home in the dark of the night. Listen to her speech before the Senate:

> "My downright violence and storm of fortunes
> May trumpet to the world."

Juliet,—is she not a heroic figure? A little girl, in the beginning of the play, whom the nurse calls a lamb, a lady-bird, she grows up before our very eyes. It is wrong to portray her at all times as a little girl. Her monologue, starting with: "Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds" sounds like a trumpet and is written in the style of Marlowe. Juliet is not asking for the night to descend; she is demanding it.

And is not Cordelia a heroic image? Director Fedorov in Sverdlovsk dressed her in military attire, helmet and

armor. The same thing was done by Kozintzev in Leningrad. Cordelia leads an army to rescue her father.

On the other hand, a woman who displays blind obedience, the unthinking Ophelia,—perhaps good-hearted, but following blindly the will of her father,—goes to inevitable doom and her dark destiny. She is sad, but not heroic. Ophelia's obedience to her father makes her a tool in the hands of Hamlet's enemies. She becomes one of the causes of his death. No wonder she loses her mind and sings the songs of a lover lost in a strange land.

The basic aspect of the many-sided genius of Shakspere is his insistence on the natural equality of all men. This is his fundamental theme; without it he would not have been the humanist he was. It is needless to say that this conviction refutes all theories of superior and inferior races. To Shakspere, as he puts it in *Henry IV,* "Homo is a common name to all men." To be sure, these words are uttered by a shady character, Gadshill, but in Shakspere the characters are not necessarily expressing their own opinions.

In certain instances the characters fulfill the function of the chorus and the sentiments expressed by them do not at all belong to their parts.

To take only one example. When Cordelia says: "Then poor Cordelia; And yet not so, since I am sure my love's more richer than my tongue." These are not her own opinion; through her the chorus appeals to the audience.

Suffice it to recall the words of the French king in *All is Well that Ends Well*:

> "Strange is it that our bloods, of color, weight and
> heat, poured all together, would quite confound distinction."

Suffice it, too, to recall *The Winter's Tale,* wherein we are told that the same sun warms the cabin of the poor man and the sumptuous palace of the lord. Such statements do not fit within the construction of the role but are of great importance for the understanding of the principal theme.

But the play wherein this idea of natural equality of men is most brilliantly expressed is *Othello*. The enormous popularity of *Othello* in the Soviet Union is explained mainly by the humanist content of the tragedy.

Some great actors in the past had interpreted this play as a tragedy of jealousy, others stressed the humanity underlying the protagonist's character. Othello, of course, is not a savage, not evil-minded. Pushkin says that by nature Othello is trustful, not jealous. This is clear if we penetrate deeper into the play. Othello himself says that he was not easily given to jealousy. If Othello were jealous by nature, there would be no need for Iago, who by his cunning and consistent intrigue forces Othello to commit the outrage. The Soviet theater presented Othello in this light, as a good man, as the victim of Iago, and not of natural jealousy; it interpreted *Othello* as a tragedy of betrayed confidence. Ostozshev in Radlov's production did so. In his correspondence Radlov laid stress on this side of Othello. The same interpretation prevailed in the production on the Georgian stage, in the theater of Rustavelli: black man and heroic white girl love one another; love, the voice of nature, united them, as it united Florizel and Perdita in *The Winter's Tale.*

However, the question will be asked: what about Shylock? Is not the dark image of Shylock a disproof of views expounded here? It is not difficult to answer this question. To a great extent Shylock is the type of an English Puritan of that epoch. He also has another side: while he attacks, he is himself a victim and suffering. To divide the play into bright images of Antonio and his friends, and dark images of Shylock and his entourage, as some Shaksperians do, is not the Shaksperian approach to the subject. Is not Antonio wicked?

A fierce, passionate man of the Renaissance is Shylock. Being a Shaksperian character he is many-sided. Pushkin pointed out this diversity. Comparing Shakspere and Molière, Pushkin says that the miser in Moliere is only avaricious. Shylock is also greedy, but he is a good father, etc. There were actors, and great ones, who were able to arouse sympathy for Shylock. One of them, Edmund Kean, playing Shylock, elicited tears from the audience. Heine wrote that subjectively Shakspere perhaps had in mind to entertain an audience with Shylock, objectively he created an image which brings forth both sympathy and anger, because Shylock is not only the aggressor, but also the

victim of aggression. This article by Heine, to a great extent, was the result of the impression created by Kean.

Ira Aldridge, the negro tragedian, who visited Russia in the fifties of the last century, interpreted *Othello* as a play full of sympathy for the black man. Aldridge fought for the liberation of Negroes from slavery; he usually gave half of his earnings to this cause. While acting, he agitated for the liberation of enslaved peoples, and for Shylock, too.

Thus the image of Shylock does not contradict the basic humanistic theme in Shakspere. Moreover, the play contains many passages which are in the same vein, confirming the natural equality of men. Shylock says: "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is?"

Today, when we are paying homage to Shakspere as the great humanist, there inevitably comes the question of his attitude to war.

If we are to look for what Shakspere says about war, we shall find such epithets as "cruel and dark war", "war of destruction", "the all-abhorred war." To Shakspere a war is justified by its just ends. I shall recall to you the end of *Cymbeline,* when the patrician Roman armies flee under the pressure of Bellarius and the young princes. People who came from the mountains are attacking the patricians who are retreating. Such a war in defense of homeland is justified. In *Henry IV* we find such justification expressed in remarkable words.

These are the Shaksperian ideas which are so precious today. His genius is not passive; it is an active force for humanism. Although his heroes perish, his villains also go disgracefully down. Shamefully perish Iago, Goneril and Regan, all of them revealed in their true natures. Edmund falls in the duel with Edgar; Claudius dies disgraced. With the strong conviction that Shakspere is with us in our struggle of today, with the feeling of joy that in spite of the war we continue to study Shakspere, to love him even more, allow me to conclude my report.

TEACHING THE SHAKSPERIAN DRAMA

By Clyde F. Lyttle

TO many students Shakspere is a closed book because the poetic form is to them a strange medium, incapable of yielding enjoyment, just as music sometimes falls on deaf ears and unmoved hearts. No one will deny that the more truly young people can see what Shakspere meant them to see, the clearer will be their thought and the keener their delight. Shakspere wrote his plays to be acted. For his effects he depended on the actor's art, relying on the vitality of the player's grasp of imagination to hold his mirror up to nature. He wrote inspired verse, but he wrote it for delivery with all the sonorous orchestration that a trained and beautiful voice can bring to the magic of speech.

For more than a quarter of a century, teaching emphasis in classroom instruction in Shakspere has veered toward this dramaturgic approach to the play as a play. Pupils are made familiar with the conventions and mechanics of the theatre and the stage becomes their laboratory. Nearly all the individual editions of Shakspere's plays intended for school use published in recent years lay heavy stress on visualization and dramatization. The trend is reflected, too, in teaching suggestions in currently used anthologies and the recommendations of current courses of study in English. Typical of the attitude is the comment: "Since the plays were written to be acted, the most obvious way of increasing understanding and enjoyment of them is to see them well acted or to act them."[1]

In 1932, Henry W. Simon, discussing the teaching of Shakspere in American schools and colleges, declared: "Though school presentations (of plays) are so common now . . . Shakspere is anything but the most frequently produced drama . . . Shakspere does have a part in the movement to produce plays in schools, but he is hopelessly outranked by the whipped-cream school of drama, represented by plays that are sweet, smooth, clean, and spineless."[2]

No one familiar with the practice of play production in American schools would attempt to demonstrate that Simon was wrong in his judgment or that the situation he describes

has materially changed in the decade which has followed the publication of his book. There are, however, certain evidences that teachers are active in a movement to restore Shakspere to the school stage. Charles Fowler Van Cleve, in a study of the teaching of Shakspere in American Secondary schools, reports a number of group projects engaging each pupil in some kind of purposeful activity which ultimately contributes to the study program of the entire class group.[3] At times, such projects take the form of the production of short versions of the plays; in other instances, presentations are made of a complete Shaksperian play. In some communities strong traditions have been established, through the years, for the production of an annual Shaksperian play. Cincinnati, Chattanooga, Birmingham, and Minneapolis are representative of this traditional practice.

"In an Alabama community, scenes from several Shaksperian plays were played under the live oaks before some of the civic clubs in 1936-37.

"A Florida senior high school urges its students to witness the play staged annually by the local junior college students. In 1936-37 *The Taming of The Shrew* was produced.

"A Tennessee community has witnessed forty successive annual productions by the Shakspere Club of its high school. *Twelfth Night* was produced in 1936-37.

"One teacher in a large Ohio city has staged a Shaksperian play annually for fifteen years in her school. She asserts that 'the constant rehearsals give interpretative possibilities (in abundance) for characterization.' In her school all departments which can contribute share in the preparation of the production.

"A teacher in the State of Washington asserts that she does not 'Teach Shakspere any more—but sees it along with her pupils.' The reference is to the program of the state theatre which takes Shakspere to the schools throughout the state by employing the services of the Seattle Repertory Theatre. In 1936-37 this group of highly trained professional actors played *The Comedy of Errors* to 27,000 high school pupils in twenty playing centers throughout the state. The state department of education has officially sponsored the movement. The direction officials look upon it as a

'fusion and correlation of School and the Theatre' and assume an 'obligation . . . to give the students . . . what is the best by the highest and most exacting adult standards.'

"Great Shaksperian actors have been brought to an Arizona city under the auspices of the English department of the senior high school. The teacher reporting states that the entire theatre is always sold out to high school pupils at a special matinee."[4]

The Quarterly Bulletin of the National Theatre Conference reports in its field notes on productions of *Hamlet, Macbeth, As You Like It, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merry Wives of Windsor,* and *Othello* in several school and community theatres during the 1940-41 season. *Center Aisle,* a journal devoted to the activities of the noncommercial theatre, records that *The Taming of the Shrew* stood fourth in popularity among the plays produced by community groups during the first five months of 1941. Many little theatre groups throughout the country are committed to the policy of presenting at least one play by Shakspere each season and are discovering that these plays have not lost their box-office value. Shaksperian Festivals have gained considerable prestige for several college theatres. In a number of communities, investigators would probably find annual productions of Shakspere actively maintained and well supported.

Opportunities can be created both within the schools and in the non-commercial theatre for a restoration of Shakspere's plays to the stage if teachers are convinced that performances of the plays studied in high school are vital to an intelligent appreciation of those dramatic masterpieces.

Certain desirable objectives might also be gained through wider use of motion picture productions of the plays. At least four of Shakspere's plays have been filmed. *The Taming of the Shrew, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Romeo and Juliet,* and *As You Like It* exist in modern sound versions, besides several early attempts at production in the era before the development of the talking motion picture.

Recordings of the plays for school use have been released by Harper and Brothers, and a recent venture of R. C. A. Victor is the release of a record-drama of *Macbeth* with

Maurice Evans and Judith Anderson as the co-stars. Walter Ginsberg reports on an experiment conducted in twenty-five schools with the Harper recordings and their accompanying texts.[5] Says Ginsberg: "Reports preponderantly favor the use of recordings in teaching Shakspere. . . . Study with records produced general comprehension and general enjoyment. More specifically, it increased understanding of the action, of the characters, of the backgrounds, of obscure passages, and the ideas and appreciation of Shakspere as poet and playwright, of the individuality of the characters, of the humor, and of the beauty of spoken verse. It stimulated classroom discussions, voluntary memorization of famous passages and voluntary further reading of Shakspere.

Summarizing the investigation, he asserts: "Along a wide educational trend, the Mercury Recordings proved a valuable aid to the appreciation of Shakspere in the classroom. . . . It is the dramatic approach to Shakspere that the recordings serve so well, displacing neither pupil nor teacher but stimulating and heightening the efforts of both."[6]

The resourceful teacher will find many avenues of approach to the problem of providing a more direct contact with Shakspere than that which is the outcome of the traditional methods of study. That such contacts are desirable was demonstrated in a series of experiments recently conducted by the writer which proved that performance is an effective aid to classroom study of drama. The procedure is reported in detail in his dissertation, "The Effectiveness of Stage Presentation as a Supplement to Shaksperean Study in the Secondary Schools," New York University, 1942.

---

[1]Ida Jewett, *Shakespeare for Today,* World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1940, page VIII.

[2]Henry W. Simon, *The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges,* p. 150.

[3]Charles F. Van Cleve, *The Teaching of Shakespeare in American Schools,* Peabody College for Teachers, 1937, p. 103-104.

[4]Charles F. Van Cleve, *op. cit.,* pp. 102-103.

[5]Walter Ginsberg, "How Helpful Are Shakespeare Recordings?" *English Journal,* XXIX, April, 1940, p. 296.

[6]Walter Ginsberg, *op. cit.,* p. 300.

SHAKSPERE'S STAGE BUSINESS

By Samuel A. Small

DURING the years of his apprenticeship in the late eighties and early nineties of the sixteenth century Shakspere used the stock material already at hand in the theatrical world. In tragedy, he presented on the stage physical horrors, violent deaths, rhetorical speeches, and ghosts—a lurid, naive attraction for his spectators. *Titus Andronicus* is rich in this theatrical business and at the time when Elizabethan plays were beginning to take shape, this tragedy must have been highly successful as a stage production. To the end of his career Shakspere's taste for this popular form of theatricality never subsided. Revolting horrors are to be found in *Macbeth, Othello,* and *King Lear.* The materials in these later tragedies are the same in kind as those in the early ones; the difference between the early and the later tragedies is in the way this stock material is treated.

Such a view of Shakspere's stage business points to the manner in which the later material for tragedy was handled. He must have emphasized inner motivation in his characters, rather than mere melodrama where external impression means everything. The idea of the introspective mind suffering from mental inhibitions is the way Shakspere in his later plays prepares the audience for an approaching horror. And in his mature drama this approach creates an enlivening sense of suspense that is more important than the horror itself. This conscience-suspense forms a subtle point of technique which this paper will attempt to describe.

Poets and playwrights of the sixteenth century were aware of the effect of horror on the mind, and it was only a step further for them to feel forebodings of all sorts in the presence of tragic happenings. The classic line of Shakspere for this sentiment is uttered by Hamlet:

> But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue.

Somewhat the same sentiment is found in *Macbeth,* IV, iii:

> Give sorrow words: the grief that does not speak
> Whispers the o'erfraught heart, and bids it break.

Similarly in Webster and Ford we find:

> Unkindness, do thy office; poor heart, break:
> Those are the killing griefs which dare not speak.
>
> *The White Devil,* II, i.

The source of this idea, found so commonly in Elizabethan drama, is the well known line from Seneca:

> They are the silent griefs which cut the heart-strings.
> *The Broken Heart,* V, iii.

The inner reaction of the character inhibits speech, and creates a dramatic pause. It is this technical stage business that Shakspere uses effectively after he wrote *Titus Andronicus.* The "hush" represents the person's conscience[1] and particularly identifies the hero as a conscience type of man who is thoroughly aware of the approaching horror. This highly tempered type is handled by Shakspere in four tragedies so delicately that the whole light-and-shade drawing of each character depends on subtle stage business. In *Richard* III, it is used near the end of the play when the ghosts of the murdered men appear; it is used technically as forebodings in *Julius Caesar;* it dominates Hamlet's idealism; and it becomes spectacular in *Macbeth.* This humanizing pause or hesitation identifies the thoroughly English type of hero which grew out of the materials of *The Spanish Tragedy, Titus Andronicus,* and other plays of Early English Drama. Early in his career Shakspere drew Titus Andronicus as a daemonic type of man having the marks of the Senecan type, but lacking Seneca's use of conscience. This superficial adaptation of Seneca characterized the early English imitators.

Richard III marks an advance. Although Richard is essentially a daemonic type of man, in the last part of the play a revolting conscience makes him human. He has conducted his life of murder through a set policy that is clearly stated in the soliloquy in *Henry VI, Part III,* Act III, ii. At the mention of the name Richmond in Act IV, iii, of *Richard III,* the element of fear for the first time enters Richard's mind. This physical fear expresses itself through the agency of a prophecy which Richard twice recalls with uneasiness:

> Carue leves loquuntur ingentis stupent.
> *Hippolytus,* 615.

> As I remember, Henry the Sixth
> Did prophesy that Richmond should be king,
> When Richmond was a little peevish boy.
> A king, perhaps, perhaps, (IV, ii)
> Richmond! When last I was at Exeter,

The major in courtesy show'd me the castle,
And called it Rougemont: at which name I started,
Because a bard of Ireland told me once,
I should not live long after I saw Richmond.

For a time, while he is wooing Queen Elizabeth's daughter through the mother, Richard manages by the force of his strong intellect to play the hypocrite to deceive the queen as he did Anne. But his hypocrisy drops off and his irritable replies betray the confused state of his mind:

King R. Fly to the duke. [*To Ratcliff*] Post thou to Salisbury:
When thou comest thither,—[*To Catesby*] Dull unmindful villain,
Why stand'st thou still, and go'st not to the duke?
(IV, iv, 442-445)

Stan. Richmond is on the seas.
King R. There let him sink, and be the seas on him!
White-liver'd runagate, what doth he there?
IV, iv, 463-465)

Third Mess. My lord, the army of the Duke of Buckingham—
King Rich. Out on you, owls! nothing but songs of death?
(IV, iv, 508-509)

His mind now becomes introspective. This condition is revealed in two passages just before the entrance of the ghosts. Both passages indicate a morbid, self-questioning state of mind:

King R. Up with my tent there! here will I lie to-night:
But where to-morrow? Well, all's one for that.
(V, iii, 7-8)

King R. I have not that alacrity of spirit,
Nor cheer of mind, that I was wont to have.
(V, iii, 73-74)

The ghosts represent revulsions of conscience. The inner effect on him is immediate. He ramifies and judges his own soul:

Give me another horse: bind up my wounds.
Have mercy, Jesu! — Soft! I did but dream.
O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
What do I fear? myself? There's none else by:
Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am:
Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why:
Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?
Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? for any good

That I myself have done unto myself?
O, no! alas, I rather hate myself,
For hateful deeds committed by myself!
I am a villain: yet I lie, I am not.
Fool, of thyself speak well: fool, do not flatter.
My *conscience* hath a thousand several tongues, etc.

(V, iii, 178-208)

Richard manages to repress his conscience before the battle:

Let not our babbling dreams affright our souls:
Conscience is but a word that cowards use,
Devised at first to keep the strong in awae:

(V, iii, 309-311)

Through the greater portion of the tragedy, Richard is made emotionless by a strong intellect which is allied to his evil ambition. His conscience does not permeate his mind either before or during the execution of his crimes. As has been pointed out, however, after the appearance of a formidable antagonist, his conscience makes itself felt, and pantomimic stage business begins.

Likewise, Brutus' character is conditioned by the working of his conscience. Philosophical by nature and entertaining only good motives, his stoical calmness makes it hard for us to detect his feelings. His mind will not harbor the first suggestion of a conspiracy:

Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius,
That you would have me seek into myself
For that which is not in me?

Julius Caesar, I, ii.

Having no personal cause for murdering Caesar, his conscience rises against it:

Between the acting of a dreaful thing
And the first motion, all the interim is
Like a phantasma or a hideous dream.

II, i.

The stage business in acting the role of Brutus is made difficult by the inner conflicts in this character's mind. Portia tells us of his actions which betray the workings of conscience against murder. Even when murder seems to him the best policy, he refuses to murder Antony with Caesar.

Brutus' strong mind is broken down by the quarrel with Cassius and this is followed by grief at the death of Portia. The first sign of fear is pretty clearly brought out in the farewell speeches between Brutus and Cassius:

> And whether we shall meet again I know not.
> Therefore our everlasting farewell take.
> For ever, and for ever, farewell, Cassius!

The stage business necessary to the growing importance of Brutus' conscience is most difficult because it is restricted by Brutus' stoical character. Dialogue must be subordinated to stage business when the actor wishes to demonstrate introspective reactions. In the case of Brutus, the stage business must be under strict control as Brutus shows only a slight outward confusion of mind. Nevertheless, his conscience is uneasy at the thought of evil from the very beginning of the play making it necessary for the actor to make a special study of this element in the play.

In the case of Hamlet, conscientious inhibitions in his mind are apparent everywhere in the play. In the long and frequent soliloquies, his conscientious reflections on life are uncertain and punctuated by pauses. This all means that, unlike the case of Brutus, the actor can be free with his stage business to make Hamlet the uncontrolled individual that he is. Hamlet is all thought and utterance; he can direct his will and conscience toward any problem and build up schemes in his mind to satisfy his frustrated ideals.

In Macbeth, on the other hand, there is a stoppage of thought and utterance; he is the most cosmic of all Shakspere's tragic figures. This cosmic sense, which emanates from evil acts, brings to the character of Macbeth a transcendent feeling of guilt. He has related his guilt to all nature: "The very stones prate of my whereabouts." Since there are frequent "hush" pauses, filled with the consciousness of guilt, the actor must use his pantomimic stage business with mathematical precision. I think the precision of bodily motion and the economy of uttered words make Macbeth a much more difficult part to play than Hamlet whose experimental type of mind gives freedom to the actor.

Shakspere's conception of tragedy underwent a considerable change in drawing the character of Brutus. Such characters as the two murderers in *Richard III,* though they crudely demonstrated the value of conscience-suspense before the deed, could not be fully handled as tragic figures. They are confirmed villains and therefore lack the proper susceptibility for subtle dramatic treatment. For the same

reason Richard is attractive in his intellectual dominance of the world about him. Richard has no concern for the finer feelings. As a man of policy and direct action, there is found in his nature no tendency for reflective thought. We have noticed that a revulsion of conscience in the Fifth Act is made possible by the use of psychological means, especially at the mention of the name of Richmond, to reduce Richard's mind to a state of introspective fear. To present characterization through the use of conscience, it was necessary for Shakspere to create a part whose action was of a far different kind from Richard's. The mind of the protagonist had to be sensitive and imaginative, so that it might respond delicately to the voice of conscience. Brutus is a character of such a type. He is not so imaginative, however, as Hamlet or Macbeth. His intellectual training was such as to cultivate the moral side of his life and to give him a somewhat stoic attitude toward the world around him.

From Richard through Brutus and Hamlet to Macbeth, Shakspere evinces a growing interest in the deeper and finer side of inner conflicts. In Richard conscience-suspense is used merely as a stage device; in Brutus it becomes part of the man's intellectual sense of duty; in Hamlet it is rooted in the man's cultural self; and in Macbeth it becomes a self communion between the man and his soul.

Huntington College, Indiana.

[1]See Stoll and Adams on conscience as an active force in Shakspere: Stoll, *E. E., Shakspere Studies,* pp. 92-93; Adams, J. Q., *Macbeth* (ed. 1931), p. 134.

MAGIC—OF AN AGE AND FOR ALL TIME

By Claire McGlinchee

THE people of the Elizabethan Age were decidedly interested in magic in its various manifestations. Our proof of this fact is the number of significant dramas of that Golden Age of the theatre that concern themselves with the supernatural, in tragic or in comic vein.

Robert Greene gives titular emphasis to that theme in his pleasant comedy of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay.* The learned Friar Bacon is not only master of the crystal globe, which power he voluntarily gives up by smashing the magic glass with his own hands, but he is near to great achievement in the business of the brazen head, through which power he would wall all England with brass—had the stupid boy Miles not broken the charm. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* presents the appalling spectacle of a brilliant doctor willing to sell his soul to Satan for all Eternity for the possession of unlimited magic power during a paltry twenty-four years.

Ghosts and witches were common apparitions to the Elizabethans—all varieties of these spirits. As in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth,* there were spirits visible to one character alone in a group and others which are seen by all present. Shakspere makes constant and effective use of these voices of Destiny, instigators of revenge, and weavers of mood and atmosphere. He has, too, actual fairies, the loveliest in all the world of literature or fact. Indeed, these tiny creatures stand guard at both ends of his career—Puck near the start and Ariel witness to the closing of not only Prospero's magic book, but of the more enchanting book of Shakspere the dramatist.

Even classic Ben Jonson, at once contemporary of and successor to Shakspere, shows in his *The Alchemist,* clever parody of human gullibility, that Elizabethan interest in the supernatural continued after the age was more accurately termed Jacobean.

It is interesting today to observe how time has dated some of this magic, proving it to have been "of an age" and how some—that of Shakspere himself—is, as he himself is, "for all time".

Marlowe's is the dated magic. In the opening scene of *Dr. Faustus,* the learned scholar, after his first visitation from the Good and Evil Angels—that touch of the Medieval Morality play—exclaims thus when left alone:

> How am I glutted with conceit of this!
> Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please,
> Resolve me of all ambiguities,
> Perform what desperate enterprise I will?
> I'll have them fly to India for gold,
> Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,
> And search all corners of the new-found world
> For pleasant fruits and princely delicates:
> I'll have them read me strange philosophy
> And tell the secrets of all foreign kings;
> I'll have them wall all Germany with brass,
> And make swift Rhine circle fair Wittenberg;
> I'll have them fill the public schools with silk,
> Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad;
> I'll levy soldiers with the coin they bring,
> And chase the Prince of Parma from our land,
> And reign sole king of all the provinces;
> Yea, stranger engines for the brunt of war
> Than was the fiery keel at Antwerp's bridge,
> I'll make my servile spirits to invent.

To eyes and minds of the year 1943, there seems to be no magic here at all. Certainly no one today would write a bond with Mephistophilis in his own blood to achieve these virtual commonplaces. "I'll have them fly to India for gold"! Planes enough from England, Europe, and the United States are roaring over India today, and what would Marlowe and his Faustus have said to our President's daring and successful flight to Casablanca for the historic conference with Mr. Churchill? "Ransack the ocean for orient pearl." An interview between William Beebe and Christopher Marlowe would be interesting at this point. For the pleasant fruits and princely delicates—the grapes out of season—that Faustus procures for the Duchess as one of the major conjurations—the man of our time need take only a few steps to the nearest de luxe grocery store.

In our days of Special Cables to newspapers, of radios, of dictaphones, what secrets of what foreign kings are difficult to learn? The difficulty now is rather to find the foreign kings! The particular ambition of most meddlers in the black arts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was

apparently to wall some country with brass. That as an achievement does not stir the ambitions of our day, though figuratively speaking, we are doing that very thing to Germany now.

The skilled engineer of our age would not be stumped to turn the current of a river, and but for war-time priorities and our boycotting of the goods from certain sources, our public schools would, like Ben Jonson's Julia, go in silks. All the eyes of the sixteenth century would blink at the strange engines for the brunt of war that are being turned out of the world's factories now by the thousands and the millions.

Yes, Marlowe's magic seems pretty humdrum to us, but what of Shakspere's?

It still requires an out and out fairy to "hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear." The prediction that after the war no place in the world will be further away in point of time from any other place in the world than sixty hours of flying is breath-taking. But Shakspere's Puck, when sent by Oberon to fetch the Love-in idleness (the fairies' love potion) and to return "Ere the leviathan can swim a league," replied:

"I'll put a girdle round about the earth in forty minutes." There's a record. Ariel exceeded even this. When his master, Prospero, urged him to speed, he answered: "I drink the air before me, and return Or e'er your pulse twice beat."

I think we should need the combined offices of Oberon and Puck to settle so happily such distressing human differences as the present counterparts of the quarrels of Demetrius, Helena, Hermia, and Lysander.

Shakspere's spirits are true fairies, matchless in daintiness of person and of tongue. They never grow up; they never die, and their magic lives with them and continues to enchant us poor mortals.

New York, N. Y.

SHAKSPERE AND *SIR THOMAS MOORE**

By Paul Deutschberger

THE object of this paper is to consider the present status of the question regarding Shakspere's alleged authorship of three pages (folios 8a, 8b, 9a) of *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore,* and to present a reargument of several aspects of the case.

As is now generally known, this play, dating from the late sixteenth century[1], exists in manuscript (*Harleian* 7368) at the British Museum. It was published for the first time in 1844 by Alexander Dyce who ventured no guess as to its authorishp. Since then this manuscript has attracted much attention because a number of modern scholars have claimed that at least three pages of it were composed by Shakspere and exist in his own handwriting.

The manuscript bears neither date nor author's name. It was early recognized as the work of more than one dramatist, and, subsequently, in its thirteen folio leaves seven distinct handwritings were noted[2] which were originally identified (by Dr. Greg) as S, A, B, C, D, and E. Since then S has been shown to be the hand A. Mundy[3], A of H. Chettle, B of Heywood[4], C of T. Kyd[5], E of T. Dekker and D of possibly Shakspere. The first page of the manuscript carries an injunction, signed by Edmund Tyllney, Master of the Revels, against the production of certain scenes of the play dealing with insurrection.

Hand D is the one claimed to be Shakspere's. Some scholars, namely, E. M. Thompson, A. W. Pollard, J. D. Wilson, C. F. Spurgeon, R. B. McKerrow, C. J. Sisson, J. M. Robertson, E. H. C. Oliphant, T. Baldwin, R. W. Chambers, and J. W. Mackail hold, or have held, that the Insurrection Scene (in D's hand) is Shakspere's. Many others do not accept that theory: S. L. Lee, E. I. Fripp, W. A. Neilson, A. H. Thorndike, H. Spencer, B. R. Lewis, J. Q. Adams, and L. L. Schücking. S. A. Tannenbaum has argued against it at great length, and it is his contribution that has prevented the proponents of the theory of Shakspere's authorship of

*In the preparation of this essay I have had the benefits of frequent consultations with Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum.

the Insurrection Scene from carrying the question by sheer weight of numbers. Finally, a few scholars, E. K. Chambers, W. W. Greg, and F. S. Boas among them, commit themselves neither way, though they incline toward accepting the evidence in favor of Shakspere's authorship of the scene.

That D, the writer of part of the Insurrection Scene, was not one of the original collaborators in the composition of the play is fairly evident. It was the Insurrection to which Tyllney specifically objected; it is therefore, surprising to find no comments of his on ff. 8a, 8b, and 9a. All the other scenes carry notations or marks of deletion in his hand. This must force us to conclude that the "Addition" (as these pages are usually designated) was added to the play after Tyllney had refused to license it.[6] This inference is corroborated by the fact that at the top of folio 10a (in the hand of Mundy) the concluding lines of Moore's original speech are retained and marked for deletion; as well as by the fact that the verso of folio 9 is blank. D's contribution, we must conclude, was substituted for Mundy's original handling of the scene. Evidently the poet who revised the Insurrection Scene attempted to render innocuous an apparently subversive part of the play by eliminating the objectionable elements in the original version of the scene.[7]

It is possible to conjecture, and, in fact, the late R. W. Chambers has so conjectured, that the original collaborators turned this scene over to some playwright whose political convictions were above question and who would make Sir Thomas speak in a manner to which the censor would not object. But this seems unlikely. Modern criticism is averse to assuming that Elizabethan playwrights expressed their own opinions through their *dramatis personae*. More probably, D assumed a set of political sentiments, not necessarily his own, to construct a scene which would neither give offense to Tyllney, nor disrupt the dramatic continuity of the play.

In the absence of other evidence, the only conclusive way to identify D is by his handwriting, for the Insurrection scene is undoubtedly in the hand of its author. Such an identification is not so simple a matter as R. W. Chambers would have had us believe. It may be very true that, as he says, the writers for the stage from 1590 to 1600 were a "few dozen at most"[8], but of that few dozen we have specimens

of the colligraphy of only a very small number. If we had none of Shakspere's handwriting, as we have none of Marlow's*, Greene's, or Beaumont's, then the "flavor of the style" and the "nature of the ideas" expressed in the disputed passages would be the only criteria in the case. But in this particular problem, having handwritings available for the determination of the question, we must attach little value to identification through aesthetic means alone. The whole case for Shakspere's authorship of the Addition must stand or fall on the palaeographic evidence alone.

This paper will present (1) a consideration of the aesthetic case, notwithstanding our caveat against it, and (2) a critique of the arguments advanced by the handwriting experts. Dover Wilson's bibliographic testimony[9] is pure hypothesis without any scientific foundation, and, as such, has been already fully answered.[10] We shall not, therefore, examine it here.

II

It was not until 1871, when Richard Simpson claimed tentatively that whole sections of *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* might be Shakspere's[11], that the problem arose. Although the existence of the play had been noted in 1721 by Thomas Hearne[12], there was no tradition previous to Simpson's paper linking the play with Shakspere's name. This lack of tradition does seem to speak against the alleged Shaksperian authorship, despite R. W. Chambers' argument that,

> "The briefness of the passage, together with the fact that the play was never printed till 1844, is sufficient to explain what in other cases is so serious a difficulty—why there should be no tradition connecting the work with Shakspere.[13]

It does seem likely that if Shakspere had in any way contributed to so important a political play, the fact would somehow have come to light — through the researches perhaps of the eighteenth century scholars, Malone, Johnson, Steevens, or Capell. The length of the passage itself is immaterial. It must be remembered that not the slightest bit of contemporary reference to the play has been discovered. Not alone is it not entered in the Stationer's Registers,

*The recent discovery of a single Marlowe signature does not affect the argument.

but there is no record of performance, nor do any of the available diaries of the period mention the play.

Furthermore, it should not be assumed that the play was unknown before Dyce's edition of it. That J. P. Collier, for instance, knew the play intimately years before its publication is evident from his repeated references to it in his *History of English Dramatic Poetry*[14] (1831).

III

The first argument advanced for the ascription of the scene to Shakspere was the rather ridiculous one that the scene is so good that it must be Shakspere's.

Simpson attributed a large part of *Sir Thomas Moore* to Shakspere on merely subjective grounds. "It depends," he tells us, "on the Shakespearian flavour, which only a critical taste can thoroughly discriminate . . ." How fallacious critical taste can be is sufficiently evident from the fact that Simpson "discriminated" Shakspere not only in D's lines, but in some of those now known to be Heywood's and C's, in many of Mundy's, and all of Dekker's.

Spedding[15] delimited the possible Shakspere contribution to D's Addition, where the problem now rests, because "it shows so marked a superiority to the rest, in every quality of dramatic composition." So impressed was Spedding with the poetry of Moore's speech to the rebels, that he felt obliged to assign the scene to Shakspere; for, said he, "if it were not his, there must have been somebody else then living who could write as well as he."

That scholarship was not impressed by this line of reasoning is evident from the lack of serious critical discusion of the problem until 1916. Spedding himelf felt that Simpson "does not pretend to offer *proof of the fact;* he gives reasons for thinking it likely."

Even if the scene did sound Shaksperian, and we shall show that it does not, we would have little reason for assigning it to Shakspere. On the basis of aesthetic criticism alone, how much of Elizabethan dramatic poetry from Marlowe to Webster might be—indeed, has been—assigned to Shakspere! It is certainly not necessary to rehearse here all the profitless arguments over the Shakspere canon. But of great

significance, and indicative of the confusion precipitated by uncontrolled guess-work, is A. W. Pollard's confession that on the basis of taste alone he would assign the disputed scene in *Sir Thomas Moore* to Heywood,[16] an opinion somewhat more tenaciously argued by Schücking.[17]

Our task is not to show that the scene is poorly written and therefore cannot be Shakspere's. Such an argument would be as fallacious as Simpson's or Spedding's. In discussing the Shakspere canon, it is just as invalid to reject a poor cene as not Shakspere's because it is poor as to accept a good one as his simply because it is good. Our problem is, rather, to show that Simpson and Spedding, as well as their followers, were mistaken in their observations, substituting opinions for facts.

The authors of *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas Moore,* as A. W. Ward before them,[18] have proceeded on the opinions of Simpson and Spedding in finding in the Insurrection Scene the Shaksperian flavor. Despite the subjective basis of their intuitions, J. M. Robertson asserted that he was from the very first convinced of Shakspere's authorship of the Addition, for, said he, ". . . there can be no pretence that any other man could write such verse."[19] But Furnivall[20] and Schücking could find little in the poetry that might be considered Shaksperian. Schücking formulated an excellent case in showing how unShaksperian the scene really is.[21] Where R. W. Chambers saw "the loftiest arguments on behalf of authority,"[22] Schücking found only empty rhetoric and sentimentality.

D often shows himself a poor dramatist. For instance, he takes no advantage of the lines where Moore, having already caught the attention of the rebels, tries to drive home his point. D allows Moore to clinch his argument with a passage lacking in those qualities of poetry which we should look for in a similar situation in Shakspere:

> lett me sett vp before your thoughts good freinds
> on supposytion, which if you will marke
> you shall perceaue howe horrible a shape
> you ynnovation beres, first tis a sinn
> which oft thappostle did forwarne vs of
> vrging obedience to aucthoryty
> and twere no error yf I told you all
> you wer in armes gainst g(od).

This passage, poor even as prose, does not present a single poetic image—certainly not a Shaksperian trope. Notice how clumsily D pads out the metre of his lines. One could hardly imagine Shakspere allowing Mark Anthony or even Brutus to address the mob with the pedagogical expression, "lett me sett vp . . . on supposytion." Besides, no supposition has been set up.

"And twere no error" and "which if you will marke" are the weakest and most obvious padding. "All" is appended to line 7 to fill out the metre, despite the fact that it weakens the line.

In the last, and most important part of Moore's speech, D breaks down entirely:

> wash your foule mynds wt teares and those same hands
> that you lyke rebells lyft against the peace
> lyft vp for peace, and your vnreuerent knees
> make them your feet to kneele to be forgyven
> is safer warrs, than euer you can make
> whose discipline is ryot, why euen yor warrs
> cannot proceed but by obedienc.

"Wash your foule mynds with teares" is nonsense, as is the absurd "your unreuerent knees make them your feet." The reviser wisely excised the unfurtunate "to kneele . . . is safer warrs," as well as the absurd exclamation, "why euen yor warrs . . . obedienc." Do not all wars require obedience? Despite the reviser's labors the passage remains high-sounding nonsense:

> what rebell captaine
> as mutynes ar incident, by his name
> can still the rout who will obay a traytor
> or how can well that proclamation sounde
> when ther is no adicion but a rebell
> to quallyfy a rebell.

"As mutynes ar incident" is meaningless. A "name," even of a "rebell captaine," cannot still a rout. The English obeyed traitors in the past—Bolingbroke, for instance; and they were to obey Cromwell. History shows that rebels are obeyed. "Rebell" has nothing to do with "proclamation." A "rebell to quallyfy a rebell" is silly and out of place.

Nor can much sense be made of

> a nation of such barbarous temper
> that breaking out in hiddious violence

> woold not afoord you, an abode on earth
> whett their detested knyves against your throtes
> spurne you lyke doggs, and lyke as yf that god
> owed not nor made not you, nor that the elaments
> wer not all appropriat to your comforts
> but chartered vnto them. . .

Lines five and six of the above passage are hopelessly confused. The metre of line five is pieced out with unnecessary words. Line seven does not scan at all.

If Shaksperian flavor, then, is the test, this scene must be rejected. Of course, this does not prove that Shakspere could not have written it. But then, this is the scene that critics have found so good that if it were not Shakspere's "there must have been somebody else then living who could write as well as he."

Dr. Greg, who originally did not believe the scene Shakspere's,[23] has developed a theory that D was merely a careless contributor who perhaps had neither knowledge of nor interest in the play on which he was at work.[24] Such reasoning might conceivably answer the objection that the scene in question might be poor and still be Shakspere's. But is it not ridiculous to claim, on the one hand, that the scene is so good that it must be Shakspere's, and, on the other hand, that it is poor because Shakspere was not interested in what he was writing. And who but an asthetic critic would believe that a poet who was ignorant of the play would have been selected to revise it to meet the censor's objections? or would have attempted to do so?

There is a further objection to the merely aesthetic argument. There are passages in *Sir Thomas Moore* which easily surpass anything in the Insurrection Scene. If we were not limited by the facts, if we did not know that these passages exist in the handwritings of known dramatists, some writers, on the basis of aesthetic criticim alone, would undoubtedly declare them to be Shakspere's. Simpson actually did so. Pollard would do so. Consider, for instance, Mundy's excellent comedy in the Faulkner scene; or C's soliloquy, "It is in heauen that I am thus and thus," which E. K. Chambers finds truly Shaksperian in phraseology and manner.[25]

Finally, there is much in the Addition, by way of word

and phrase, that is entirely unlike Shakspere's characteristic diction. We shall not here take advantage of Schücking's argument based upon *hapax legomena.* He points out that there are no less than twenty-two specific uses of word and phrase in the Insurrection Scene which are without parallel in Shakspere's acknowledged works.[26] Schücking also notes D's fondness for "interrupting himself with a short sentence, commencing with 'as'."[27] This occurs three times in 119 lines of the Addition, but seems uncharacteristic of Shakspere's verse. Moore's "say nowe" (line 138) is utterly unShakperian. We may call attention, too, to Lincoln's "Nay *this* a sound fellowe" (line 212), "this" being, of course, a contraction of "this is." Nowhere in Shakspere's prose can any example of this absorption be found.

IV

The second line of argument was first developed in 1923 by the late R. W. Chambers. Taking his cue from Professor W. Raleigh,[28] Chambers argued that Shakspere was obsessed with an almost insane fear of social and political chaos. The language in which Shakspere expressed this fear, Chambers finds so intense that it could not have been born out of the "general temper" of the time. Chambers insists that a close relationship exists between Moore's speech and that of Ulysses on Degree in *Troilus and Cressida* (*c.* 1603). In both he sees an intense expression of the fear of that chaos which hould be engendered if the existing social order were overturned.

But the thought in these passages is not unique in the Elizabethan age; neither is the intense expression of that particular fear the hallmark of Shakspere; nor, does Moore's speech to the rebels parallel the speech of Ulysses.

I have already indicated above that we cannot accept the thought of the Insurrection Scene as being any particular Elizabethan dramatist's confession of political faith. The Addition, as it stands, exists only because Mundy had previously written another scene which had proved offensive to Tyllney. Because of the political circumstances surrounding the play, we cannot expect Moore's speech to express any other philosophy than it does.

Nevertheless, Chambers would have us believe that this

particular "intensity" of feeling for social order is to be found only in Shakspere and in D. He asks us to read Sir John Cheke's *The Hurt of Sedition* (1549) in connection with *Sir Thomas Moore* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Cheke, he says,

> "never reaches the standpoint to which Shakespeare and the writer of the '147 lines' leap instantly . . . At the back of the mind of both More and Ulysses seems to be a nightmare vision of a world in chaos. This is not common: . . . To Shakespeare, and to the writer of the '147 lines,' the disregard of order does not lead up to such commonplace scourges as war, dearth, and pestilence."

This is purposive exaggeration and misrepresentation. Chambers reveals himself to be rather ignorant of a great many Tudor writings—for the above point of view is not at all uncommon. There is, for example, that magnificent passage in Marlowe's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*:

> Roome was so great it could not beare it selfe:
> So when this worlds compounded vnion breakes,
> Time ends and to old *Chaos* all things turne;
> Confused stars shal meete, celestiall fire
> Fleete on the flouds, the earth shoulder the sea,
> Affording it no shoare, and *Phoebe's* waine
> Chace *Phoebus* and, inrag'd, affffect his place,
> And striue to shine by day, and, ful of strife,
> Disolue the engins of the broken world.[29]

With similar intensity Spenser saw civil confusion as a manifestation of the forces of universal dissolution:

> When that brave honour of the Latine name,
> Which mear'd her rule with Africa and Byze,
> With Thames inhabitants of noble fame,
> And they which see the dawning day arize,
> Her nourslings with mutinous uprore
> Harten against her selfe, her conquer'd spoile,
> Which she had wonne from all the world afore,
> Of all the world was spoyl'd within a while.
> So when the compast course of the universe
> In sixe and thirtie thousand yeares is ronne,
> The bands of th'elements shall backe reverse
> To their first discord, and shall be quite undonne:
> The seedes, of which all things at first were bred,
> Shall in great Chaos wombe againe be hid.[30]
> . . . Nor prince, nor peere, nor kin, they woulde abide . . .[31]
> What fell Erynnis . . . Did grype your hearts . . .
> That, each to other working cruell wrongs,
> Your blades in your owne bowels you embrew'd?[32]
> Thou onely cause, O Civil Furie art: . . .
> Didst arme thy hand against thy proper hart.[33]

Even the popular sermons of the time expressed this view, and with the same intensity. Consider, for example, the *Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* (*c.* 1570):

> For he that nameth rebillion nameth not a singular or only sin, as is theft, robbery, murder, and such like; but he nameth the whole puddle and sink of all sins against God and man; against his prince, his country, his countrymen, his parents, his children, his kinfolks, his friends, and against all men universally; all sins, I say, against God and men heaped together nameth he that nameth rebellion.[34]

Most damaging to Chambers's argument is the fact that the scene from *Moore* sounds so much like Cheke, that it may very well be considered a kind of metrical paraphrase of Cheke's pamphlet.

The total impression left by Cheke's logic is that rebellion against the king does lead to chaos. Yet, Chambers dismisses Cheke as having the "practical point of view of the ordinary Englishman," in contradistinction to that of Shakspere, and Dr. Chambers finds that "Both Moore and Ulysses depict disobedience as a . . . terrible thing: a thing inconsistent with the order which even war demands: a thing leading straight to anarchy." We must not be misled by the irrelevant quotation from Cheke that Chambers puts into opposition with this statement. Elsewhere, Cheke makes the same point much more spiritedly:

> but yee that seeke in word Gods cause, doe break in deed Gods commandement: and yee that seeke the commonwealth, have destroyed the commonwealth: and so yee marre that yee would make, and break that yee would amend, because yee neither seek anything rightly, nor would amend anything orderly.[35]

Cheke, it will be noticed, uses the same antitheses which Moore employs in a similar situation:

> and those same hands
> that you lyke rebells lyft against the peace
> lyft vp for peace . . .

Indeed, in this passage, as in others, Cheke is so close to D in expression and thought, that, using the method of a Spedding or Chambers, we might declare *The Hurt* of Sedition the work of Shakspere.

Chambers, for instance, is impressed by Moore's speech because "it does not stoop to terrorize the rebels . . . (with) talk of gibbets and the hangman, . . . Moore terriorizes the

mob, not by putting before them the penalties involved by the failure of their enterprise, but by the penalties involved by its success. . . ." Certainly this is more true of Cheke. Moore speaks of exile and declares that "mercy may be found." Restored to its proper context, the long passage Chambers quotes from Cheke presents an even more nightmarish aspect than either Moore's speech or that of Ulysses. After listing the evils of sedition, Cheke laments,

> in sedition both parts loseth, the overcommed cannot fly, the overcommer cannot spoile; the more the winner winneth, the more he loseth; the more that escape, the more infamous men live; all that is gained, is scarcely saved, the winning is losse, the losse destruction.[36]

Moore makes exactly the same point in a less telling way:

> you had taught
> how insolenc and strong hand shoold prevayle
> how ordere shoold be quelld, and by this patterne
> not on of you shoold lyve an aged man.

Where Moore concludes:

> submyt you to theise noble gentlemen
> entreate their mediation to the kinge
> gyve vp yoursealf to forme obay the maiestrate
> and thers no doubt, but mercy may be found
> yf you so seek(yt).

Cheke entreats the rebels with more passion:

> Wherefore for Gods sake have pittie on your selves . . . with humble submission acknowledge your faults . . . leave off with repentance . . . aske God forgiveness, submit yee to your King, be contended for a Commonwealth one or two to die, and yee Captains for the residue sacrifice your selves, and yee shall so best attain the Kings gracious pardon . . . [37]

The major part of Chambers's argument collapses, then, because it can be shown that both Moore's speech and that of Ulysses most certainly arise from the "general temper" of the Tudor period; both resort to a set of conventional images or symbols more properly medieval than Renaissance in nature.

V

The third line of argument is the contention that both Moore and Ulysses appeal to "Degree," that the natural order is based upon an immutable, ascending scale of authority which cannot be interrupted without plunging all things into chaos; and that this appeal to "Degree" is a direct indication of Shakspere's hand.

The truth of the matter is that Moore makes no appeal to "Degree." Even if he did, it would be of little significance in our study. I have elsewhere shown that Ulysses' speech is a mere rephrasing of the commonplace of sixteenth-century political thought, and that it has many analogues in some of the most popular and widely read tracts of the time.[38]

Chambers argues, however, that both speeches proceed with the same logic and the same choice of images, and, accordingly, only Shakspere could have written both. The sequence of image that Chambers draws up is this:

> a) Degree neglected, b) the flood surging over its banks, c) the doing to death of the aged or the babes, d) cannibal monsters.[39]

But let us examine both speeches. Admitting that this is *approximately* the order of images in Ulysses' speech, is it true of Moore's?

Moore begins by declaring that the rebels, in breaking the peace, violate the very security that "brought (them) to the state of men" (lines 75-83). He continues by pointing to the sorry plight of the "wretched straingers" (lines 87-94). From this he returns to his first idea—that if "ordere shoold be quelld" not one of the rebels "shoold lyve an aged man," for, "men lyke ravenous fishes woold feed on on another" (lines 94-102).

The sequence of thought and image that Chambers constructs does not apply to the logic of Moore's speech. A) Moore says nothing of "Degree". B) The reference to "the flood surging over its banks," (lines 50-52) is no essential part of Moore's speech—it is merely a side remark to the Lord Mayor *et al.*, before Moore begins to address the rebels. In Shakspere's pattern such a catastrophe is the direct sequel to Degree neglected. C) In comparing Ulysses' "And the rude son should strike his father dead," to Moore's picture of the "wretched straingers," Chambers is equating two ideas which have nothing at all in common. Ulysses makes no such appeal as "Helpless childhood or age must suffer" during civil disorder. He is merely restating an axiom of Tudor political thought, that the son owes the same right of obedience to the father that the subject owes to the king. As Professor J. W. Allen puts it:

> Every conceivable 'right' expresses Divine Will. Real authority,

whether in a king or in the father of a family, is a right to demand obedience as a duty to God.[40]

Not alone does Moore's speech not follow the neat pattern Chambers has found for it, but the situations surrounding both the *Moore* and *Troilus and Cressida* speeches differ. Moore is trying to quell a rebellion of the lowest stratum of society against constituted authority. Ulysses is not faced with rebellion, but with disharmony among the military leaders. There is no thought of "mob law" in *Troilus and Cressida,* and Chambers does violence to the whole idea of Ulysses' speech by declaring that there is.[41]

Moore's main appeal is the sentimental one:

ymagin that you see the wretched straingers
their babyes at their backs, and their poor lugage
plodding tooth ports and costs for transportacion*
and that you sytt as kings in your desyres
aucthoryty quyte sylenct by your braule.

Moore expatiates on the Golden Rule:

what Country . . .
shoold gyve you harbor go you to ffranc or flanders
to any Iarman province spane or portigall
nay any where that not adheres to Ingland
why you must needs be straingers. woold you be pleased
to find a nation of such barbarous temper
that breaking out in hiddious violence
woold not afoord you an abode on earth . . .
what woold you thinck
to be thus vsed, this is the straingers case
and this your momtanish[42] inhumanyty.

There is nothing in *Troilus and Cressida* to parallel this. But Cheke, like D, resorts to this sentimental argument:

remember your wives, your children, your country
and forsake this rebellion.[43]

Furtherfore, unlike Ulysses, Moore appeals, not to Degree, but to the Divine Right of Kings. When Moore tells the rebels

you wer in armes gainst g[od]
for to the king goth hath his offic lent, *etc.,*

he is repeating, in almost the same figures, Cheke's

But the Magistrate is the ordinance of God, appointed by him with the sword of punishment . . . And therefore that that is done by the

*'Luggage' plodding 'to the ports and coasts' would be unworthy of Shakespere at any time. Absurdity and padding combined.

> Magistrate, is done by the ordinance of God, because he hath the execution of Gods office . . .[44]

So Spenser puts forth the same idea:

> All in the powre of their great Maker lie:
> All creatures must obey the voice of the most Hie.
>
> He maketh kings to sit in soverainty
> He maketh subjects to their powre obay.[45]

Not Degree but the sentimental appeal is the central idea of Moore's speech. But it is amusing to find after Chambers has made so much of Shakspere's monopoly on Degree, Anthony Mundy, elsewhere in *Sir Thomas Moore,* summing up the essential thought of Ulysses' speech, making Lincoln say:

> obedience is the best in eche degree . . .
> I paciently submit to lawe.[46]

As to the "cannibal monsters," Cheke tells us that rebels fall from the state of men to that of animals:

> not onely to annoy themselves, but to destroy all other . . . like frantick beasts, raging against their head, doe teare and deface as much as lyeth in them.[47]

Even as Ulysses' speech was a mere poetical summary of several dominant political ideas and religious trends of the sixteenth century, D's arguments are even more lacking in originality. Tyllney's censoring dictated what tone the scene should take; D had no alternative but to subdue the rioters with whatever conventional ideological expressions he could find. The result was a set of political sentiments identical with those then being promulgated by the government's apologists and enunciated from every Anglican pulpit.

Since both Moore's speech and that of Ulysses are merely rewordings of conventional themes, part of a common stock of ideas from which any writer might draw, we must reject this phase of Chambers's case. Furthermore, our analysis demonstrates that D and Shakspere are not one and the same, because Moore's speech and that of Ulysses are wholly unlike in the development of thought and image.

[*To be continued*]

---

[1]The exact date of the play is still in dispute, suggestions ranging from 1590 to 1608 It seems certain that the play must be dated prior to 1597 on the evidence of Tyllney's injunction on the first page of the ms. After 1597 Sir George Buc, for whom Tyllney

had secured the reversion of the Mastership (J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert,* 1917, p. 7), gradually took over his ailing uncle's duties. Sisson's objection that *Cupid's Whirligig* was licensed by Tyllney as late as 1607 overlooks the fact that most of the licenses granted during Tyllney's office were granted in his name, so that Tyllney may actually have had nothing at all to do with *Cupid's Whirligig.* We cannot accept Schücking's dating, 1604-5 (*Eng. Studien,* XLVI, 228-251). Oliphant argues almost groundlessly for 1598-9 (*JEGP,* XVIII, 231, 235). Pollard (*Shakespeare's Hand in the Play Sir Thomas More,* 1923, 17-32) argues for 1593-4. In the light of Tannenbaum's researches (*The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore,* 1927, p. 95-101) early 1593 seems most likely. For, although this date depends largely upon the acceptance of hand C as Kyd's, the political implications of the play and its censoring point to that date.

[2]The capital letters are Greg's designations in the Malone Society edition of the play.

[3]"S" meaning "scribe," not Shakspere, as B. R. Lewis, *Shakespeare Documents,* I, 1940, p. 278n., would have us believe. Greg originally thought that Mundy had acted only as copyist.

[4]Tannenbaum's identification of Heywood on paleographic grounds, *op. cit.,* p. 56-68, must take precedence over Law's counter-arguments on spelling, *U. of Texas Stud. in Eng.,* XI, 1931, p. 24-31.

[5]The objections set forth by Greg, *TLS,* Nov. 24, 1927; *The Library,* IX, 1928, p. 202-211; by McKerrow, *RES,* IV, p. 237; by Sisson, *MLR,* XXIII, 1928, p. 231-234; are merely captious, not based on evidence, and do not invalidate Tannenbaum's theory, *op. cit.,* p. 35-52, *et passim.*

[6]Tannenbaum, *op. cit.,* p. 79.

[7]In 1592, a year before the play was probably written, Mundy published *The Masque of the League and the Spaniard Discovered* (*v.,* W. C. Hazlitt's *Handbook,* 1867, p. 406) of which, apparently, no copy remains. In 1605 this was re-issued under the title, *Falsehood in Friendship,* the second part of which Mr. Herman R. Mead, Bibliographer of the Huntington Library, has sent me in microfilm reproduction. Since Mundy was the original author of the Insurrection Scene, and since much of the thought of that scene is repeated in *Falsehood in Friendship,* it is safe to assume that D's creative part in the play is not as large as was formerly supposed. But that is a study in itself.

[8]*Man's Unconquerable Mind,* 1939, p. 209.

[9]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 113-141.

[10]Tannenbaum, *Shakspere and Sir Thomas Moore,* 1929, p. 44-60; *Hjort, Lond, Merc.,* Nov., 1924, p. 80-81.

[11]*NQ,* July 1, 1871, p. 1-3.

[12]*Collections,* IX, p. 393.

[12]Collections, IX, p. 393

[13]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 143.

[14]I, p. 94; II, p. 435; III, p. 372.

[15]*NQ,* Sept. 21, 1927, p. 228.

[16]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 14.

[17]*RES,* I, p. 41-49.

[18]*Hist. of Eng. Dram. Lit.,* 1874, II, p. 214-217.

[19]*The Genuine in Shakespeare,* 1930, p. 135.

[20]*Intro., Royal Shakespeare,* 1894, p. cviii-cxv.

[21]*RES,* I, p. 41-49.

[22]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 178.

[23]Malone Soc. ed., p. xiii.

[24]*Ibid., loc. cit.*

[25]*William Shakespeare,* I, 1930, p. 514.

[26]*RES,* I, p. 44-45.

[27]*Ibid.,* p. 45.

[28]*Shakespeare,* 1907, p. 191-192.

[29]*Works of Christopher Marlowe,* Tucker Brooke, ed., 1910, p. 650, lines 72-80.

[30]*Ruines of Rome,* stanza, xxii.

[31]*Ibid.,* xxiii.

[32]*Ibid.,* xxiv.

[33]*Ibid.,* xxxi.

[34]*Ibid.,* xxxi.

[34]*Homilies,* Griffiths, ed., 1859, p. 569.
[35]*The True Subject to the Rebell, or The Hurt of Sedition How Grevious It is to a Common Wealth,* 1641, p. 3.
[36]*Ibid.,* p. 63.
[37]*Ibid.,* p. 64.
[37]*SAB, XVII,* p. 200-207; vide, in connection with this, Fulke Greville's *Poems of Monarchy, Works,* Grosart, ed., 1870, p. 119, stanza 324; Bodin, *Six Books of the Republic,* Bk. III, R. Nnolles, trans., p. 387.
[39]*MLR,* XXVI, 1931, p. 264.
[40]*Hist. of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century,* 1928, p. xiv-xv.
[41]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 157.
[42]Dyce substitutes "mountanish." Brooke defends the ms. reading as something like "mohamedanish." There are two other possible readings; "Montanish," referring to the Montanist sect; the Gnostics prided themselves on being the guardians of the spirit, the Montanists on being the guardians of the law. Those who take the law wilfully might be called "Montanists." The word itself was not strange to the sixteenth century, *v.,* Hammer, *Anc. Eccl. Hist.,* 1577; Greville's *Heskin's Parl.,* 1579; and Hooker's *Eccl. Pol.,* 1597. The second reading is a derivation of "maumet," literally "an idol." This was generally a term of abuse—as "mome" it was common in the drama of Udall's time. *Cf. Romeo and Jul.,* III, v. 186; Haughton, *Englishmen for My Money,* IV, ii. Drayton refers to "Momish sects," *Barons Warres,* II, iv.
[43]*Op. cit.,* p. 64.
[44]*Ibid.,* p. 4.
[45]*FQ,* V, canto II, xl.
[46]Folio 11a, line 60.
[47]*Op. cit.,* p. 16.
[48]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 156.
[49]*RES,* VI, 1930, p. 1-14.
[50]2*Hen* VI, IV, vii.
[51]*Rich* III, I, ii.
[52]*M.N.D.,* II, i.
[53]*Hen V,* IV, vii.
[54]*PMLA, LVII,* 1942, p. 638-653.
[55]***Hamlet,*** **I, i.**
[56]*Rich II,* I, ii.
[57]*Ibid.,* IV, i.
[58]*Institutio,* Lefranc, ed, p. 774.
[59]*Ibid.,* p. 775, 776, *et passim.*
[60]*Annotation to the Thirteenth Chapter of the Romans,* Parker Soc., p. 103.
[61]*De Vera Obedienta,* Eng. trans. 1553, Janelle, ed., 1930, p. 97.
[62]*The Last Trumpet* (1550), EETS, xv, 1872, p. 69.
[63]*De Regimine Principum,* 1482, lib. I, pt. 2, chap. 12.
[64]*Op. cit.,* p. 4.
[65]*The Way to Wealth* (1550), EETS, xv, 1872, p. 131.
[66]*M. Ven.,* I, i.
[67]*Seven Sermons* (1549), Arber repr., 1869, p. 49.
[68]*Cor. I,* vi.
[69]*Schoolmaster,* III, Giles, ed., 1864, p. 128.
[70]*Cor.* I, i.
[71]Quoted by Dyce, *Sir Thomas More,* 1844, p. ix.
[72]*Op. cit.,* p. 24.
[73]*A Supplicacyon for the Beggers* (1529), Eng. Scholar's Lib., 1878, p. 7-8.
[74]EETS, Cowper, ed., 1871, j. 81.
[75]*Merrill, Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald,* 1925, p. 391.
[76]*The Way to Wealth,* p. 132.
[77]Florio's trans., Everyman ed., II, 1921, p. 186.
[78]*Ibid.,* II, 271.
[79]*Inferno,* VII, 8.
[80]*Purgatorio,* XX, 10.
[81]*Asinaria,* II, iv; may I here thank Professor Garrett Mattingly for tracing the

origin of this famous expression, as well as for other useful material too general for specific mention?

[82]*Poetae Bucolici et Didactici,* "Phile de Animalibus, *etc.,*" Dubner, ed., 1863, p. 27.

[83]*Der Physiologus in der Elisabethanischen Literatur,* 1930.

[84]*Euphues,* Croll and Clemens, eds, 1916, p. 64.

[85]*RES,* I, p. 44.

[87]*Poetaster,* c. 1601, V, iii, line 158.

[88]Private communication from Professor Palmer.

[89]*Dutch Courtesan, I, i,* line 1.

[90]*Ibid.,* line 39.

[91]*Sh's H. in STM,* p. 167.

[92]*RES, I,* 57-58.

[93]2*Hen VI,* IV, ii.

[94]*STM, I,* i.

[95]*Ibid.*

[96]Tannenbaum's *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore,* 1927, especially with its identification of Hand C as Kyd's seems to suggest Marlowe as D.

[97]Schücking has suggested Drayton as a possibility, *RES,* I, p. 57. *The Barons Warres* (1596, 1603) alone presents much material for a line of argument such as Chambers' or Spurgeon's. D's curious use of "incident" is repeated in Bk, III, 9. The sentimentality of D appears fullblown in Bk. IV, 47. Bk. IV, 55-55, is a hymn to order with much in common with Ulysses' speech on Degree, and, in itself, an adequate refutation of Chambers' thesis that D and Shakspere only spoke with the greatest intensity on that subject. D's concept of Magistrates is repeated in Bk. V, 17, and more explicitly in Bk. V, 36. Drayton's use of "momish" has been commented upon above, note 42.

[98]Haughton, like Drayton, was a frequent collaborator with Mundy, Chettle, and Heywood. He was probably writing for the stage as early as 1593. Baugh, *William Haughton's Englishmen for My Money,* 1917, suggests that Henslowe's "yonge horton" meant that Houghton was younger than the other playwrights working for him, not necessarily a youth. It must be remembered that he is not to be confused with the Haughton who was incorporated in the M.A. degree at Cambridge in 1604 as Cooper (*Athenae Cantabrigiensis, II,* 399) believed (Baugh, *op. cit.,* p. 15).

MUCH ADO ABOUT SOMETHING*

By George C. Taylor

THE proverbial cow which always gave five gallons of milk at each milking and always ended by kicking the full pail over, comes to mind as one reads Kelley's in many ways valuable work. This book is certain to prove of great interest and value to all Milton scholars. Particularly valuable is Professor Kelley's bibliographical handling of *The Christian Doctrine itself.* His treatment of this work when unrelated to other works of Milton is invaluable to the student of Milton bibliography and text. Exceedingly valuable also is his interpretation of a great number of details in *Paradise Lost,* which have hitherto been misunderstood by English scholars. We are undoubtedly under a great debt to Mr. Kelley for his book, and for emphasizing once more that we cannot hope to gain a complete understanding of *Paradise Lost* without constantly consulting *Christian Doctrine.*

As soon, however, as Kelley begins to discuss the relation of *Christian Doctrine* to anything else either in or outside of Milton, one finds the grain and the chaff so inextricably mixed that it would take a fairy godmother to separate them. Nevertheless, the reviewer will attempt to illustrate.

The exceptionally large space given over to parallel passages in *Paradise Lost* and *Christian Doctrine* throw in very many instances light upon the meaning of disputed passages in *Paradise Lost.* His contention, however, that Milton means in his poetry exactly what he means in his prose in each and every instance is preposterous, particularly in view of what Milton expressly declares repeatedly in *Paradise Lost* as to why he has to leave matters in a work of art open to more than one interpretation in poetry.[1] Milton, theologian plus artist, was peculiarly conscious of the necessity for freedom in the treatment of any substance going into a poem. Again, as to the matter of the date of the final form of *Doctrine,* Kelley has assembled valuable data indeed, but realizing that *Christian Doctrine* has to be dated just exactly right in order to count as a determining

*This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's 'De Doctrina Christiana' as a Gloss Upon 'Paradise Lost.' By Maurice Kelley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941, pp.xiv-269, $5.00.

influence upon the exact meaning of passages in *Paradise Lost,* he strains to the breaking point his attempt to change conjectures into certainties. At all points we find the excellence of the scholarship qualified by the spirit of the clever advocate and debater. One of the most amusing instances of this is perhaps unconscious. Taylor, he says, showed up all modern source study as unsound. But Taylor' suggested single source is a false source. The right source is, instead of Du Bartas, *Christian Doctrine.* Ergo, Kelley reaps the cream of Taylor's researches. Says Prince Hal to his father, Henry IV,

> Hotspur "is but my factor, good my Lord,
> To engross up glorious deeds on my behalf."

The speciousness of the argument is at once apparent when an examination of Taylor's work shows that he never once maintained that any one of the sources suggested was not a source, but was simply putting in a plea for an ignored source in addition to the other sources already suggested.

One who handles others without gloves must expect to be handled without gloves. Hence it is necessary to notice how Kelley belabors other Milton scholars for not concerning themselves *primarily* with *The Christian Doctrine* in recent years. It may be appropriate to suggest that they have not done so because of the fact that it had already been done, though not exhaustively, very many years ago. It is only fair to say that Mr. Kelley is aware of this himself.[2] Scholars often prefer to get off the beaten highway into by-paths. Kelley discounts almost entirely the knowledge that contemporary scholars in the field of Milton research have of *The Christian Doctrine.* His remarks about the researches, for example, of Fletcher, Saurat, Greenlaw, Taylor, and Tillyard, suggest that these scholars know little if anything about it. Frank A. Patterson, whose name is not even mentioned by Kelley, and who is to be thanked for making the text (without all the citations) easily accessible to us all, I imagine knows a good deal about *The Christian Doctrine.* More than any other modern scholar, Patterson has compelled us to reckon with *Christian Doctrine* in interpreting *Paradise Lost.* He said in 1933:

> We should begin at once to formulate what we believe was Milton's conception of God. To this end it will be well to read through, if time allows, the entire *Christian Doctrine* before starting to study *Paradise Lost,* and then to refer to it continually throughout the reading of the poem.[3]

And repeatedly in his notes he suggests in detail how *Christian Doctrine* would be examined as explaining *Paradise Lost.* This reviewer, too, for example, although called to account severely for ignorance of *The Christian Doctrine,* made the following statement ten years before the publication of *This Great Argument,* in *Studies in Philology,* XXVIII (1931), 123:

> "These are merely a few of the allusions in Shakspere to that elaborately worked out theological scheme of salvation with which Milton in his *Christian Doctrine* and *Paradise Lost* shows such detailed familiarity. Shakspere's knowledge of such matters was surely not scholarly, his allusions not beyond the average playgoer of his day. These matters must have been the commonplace of the age, a fact which those of us working into the new sources of Milton sometimes forget in attempting to establish very definite relations between Milton and those who, like him, use these conventions of the Medieval and Renaissance theologians. What Gilbert demonstrated in his article "Milton and the Mysteries,'" is doubtless true of many other works or series of works in which scholars are now seeking to find the definite sources of Milton."[4]

One of the reasons, therefore, why the scholars attacked by Kelley have not devoted all their intellectual energies to *Christian Doctrine* is that they were allowing undergraduates with the aid of *Christian Doctrine* as a possible gloss, to work out term papers concerning many of the very points taken up in Mr. Kelley's book, merely as subjects of altercation proper for the exercise of an adolscent's intellect. Kelley joins the ranks of a band of scholars who, without ever having written a single book, do not hesitate to speak without any marked degree of courtesy about men who have written pretty fair books. Fletcher, for example, "fails to understand"; Tillyard is accused of "critical mysticism, unbridled impressionism"; Greenlaw's "failure to recognize in *Paradise Lost* Milton's concept of the manifold nature of the Fall vitiates, if it does not render valueless, the recent studies of the lapse by Greenlaw"; and Taylor in his *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* is "obsessed". A scholar has a right to disagree with any man. But surely it must still be possible even in these rough and ready days, to do this without assuming that the scholar with whom one disagrees is on a low intellectual level.

May I call attention to a most remarkable instance of Kelley's reasoning processes. He thinks that the differences between the theological doctrines of Du Bartas and Milton

prove that Milton was not influenced by Du Bartas.[5] One might as well contend that when Havens asserts that Blackmore was an imitator, if not a plagiarizer of Milton, that Havens is absurdly wrong because Milton is an Arian and Blackmore never loses an opportunity of confuting Arianism. Taylor is only remotely concerned in *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* in any agreement of Du Bartas and Milton as to hair-splitting distinctions in theology; he is concerned with what Kelley apparently is entirely unaware of, the interest of a *literary* genius in the *literary* expression of one whom he read and remembered. Should we handcuff *Paradise Lost* to *The Christian Doctrine,* we should thereby devise the surest method of cutting Milton off from the intelligent readers of the modern world. Even if *Paradise Lost* agreed line by line with *The Christian Doctrine,* that would have absolutely nothing to do with Milton's reading, liking, and remembering any other books dealing with the same themes.

When a scholar's mind moves on the basis of logic just illustrated, the final conclusions at which he arrives are to be accepted in every case with very decided qualifications.

---

[1]See Gilbert, *MLN.* LV (March, 1940), p. 215.
[2]See *This Great Argument,* p. 5.
[3]*The Student's Milton.* "Notes on the Poetry," p. 75.
[4]See further. R. A. Law, "Shakspere in the Garden of Eden," University of Texas, *Studies in English,* 1941: K.O. Myrick, "The Theme of Damnation in Shakspereian Tragedy," *Studies in Philology,* XXXVIII (April, 1941), 221 ff.
[5]*This Great Argument,* p. 203.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

By S. A. T.

AN IMPORTANT NEW BOOK

Professor Oscar J. Campbell's new book, *Shakespeare's Satire,* published by the Oxford University Press (for $3.75), is one of the more interesting and one of the sanest books published this year. Dr. Campbell attempts in its pages to enlarge our conception of Shakspere as a satirist; to convince us that in the plays which are generally supposed to betray Shakspere's bitterness, we should look only for a satiric impulse; that those dramas of his that seem to have been written with a 'harsh critical spirit' were really the results of his imitation of 'a popular literary fashion.' The plays which Professor Campbell studies from this viewpoint are *Love's Labor's Lost, As You Like It, Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Timon of Athens, Measure for Measure, Troilus and Cressida,* and—most amazing—*Coriolanus.* Other plays, *Henry IV, The Merry Wives, King John, Twelfth Night, Romeo and Juliet,* etc., are dis-

cussed incidentally.

Unquestionably there is much in this book of 240 pages (without an index—an unpardonable fault in a scholarly book) with which one acquainted with Shakspere's work will agree, and there is much with which he will not agree. To most readers, we think, Professor Campbell's book will appear as a huge and frail structure built on an untenable conception of the nature of satire and a desire to paint Shakspere as a person interested in problems of political philosophy.

We do not intend to argue these questions; Professor Campbell is entitled to his viewpoint, and arguments on such subjective matters inevitably lead to nothing. But there is one matter connected with his book to which we take serious exception. Professor Campbell ends his preface with the following sentence: "In my quotations of Shakespeare's lines I have followed the text of George Lyman Kittredge's edition of *Shakespeare's Complete Works.*" Any standard text would have answered the author's purpose; in not a single instance is his interpretation of a passage in any play dependent on a text which would require Kittredge's support. It is a matter for great astonishment therefore to discover that Dr. Campbell's statement regarding his quotations is woefully and exasperatingly incorrect, probably because of careless copying and incompetent proof-reading—if he really used K's book.

The departures from Kittredge involve not only substitutions of commas for periods, periods for commas, and commas for semicolons, but the omission of hyphens, changes in spelling, the addition of stage-directions, the substitution of words, and the failure to indicate elisions of vowels for metrical reasons. What the eccentric Professor Kittredge's reactions would have been to these corruptions of his text may well be imagined.

On page 73, in a passage from *2 Henry IV,* (II, iv, 177-83) Dr. Campbell has omitted four of Kittredge's commas, added one, and changed 'packhorses' to 'pack horses'. On p. 104 C reads 'shrewdly' for K's 'shrowdly'; on p. 106 (quotation from *T & C,* III, iii, 251-57) 'an hostess' is changed to 'a hostess' (line 2), 'this' to 'his' (1. 5); on p. 111 'Th' imaginary' is replaced by 'The imaginary'; on p. 112 he omits a necessary comma after 'rub on' and omits the hyphen in 'fee-farm'; on p. 113 he inserts the stage-direction *'aside'* after 'Pandarus,' incorrectly; on p. 114 he prints 'thievery' for 'thiev'ry'; on p. 131 a needed punctuation mark is wanting after 'precise'; on p. 153 (1.3, a quotation from a familiar passage in *Hamlet*) *'you* nickname' is replaced by *'and* nickname'; on p. 154 a quotation is ruined by a period (instead of a comma) after 'bed', and 'Stew'd' is replaced by 'Stewed'; on p. 157 Hamlet's 'forgone' is misrepresented by 'foregone' and *'this* majestical roof' is replaced by 'the majestical roof', 'faculties' by 'faculty', *'and* moving by *'in* moving'; on p. 161 (the second quotation from *Othello*) 'i'th'' is replaced by 'in the'; on p. 164 K's *'art* incestuous" is changed to *'are* [!] incestuous' and *'in* pieces' to *'to* pieces'; on p. 165 we have a genuine howler: *'small* vices' is replaced by *'great* vices' and 'sin' by 'sins'; on p. 171 *'an* usurer' is changed to *'a* usurer'; on p. 207 a passage from *Hamlet* is mangled by the omission of the comma after 'soldier's'; on p. 209 'His *heart's* his mouth' is spoiled by the reading *'hearts';* on p. 213 *'this* child Like him by chance' is converted into *'his* child, Like him by chance'; on p. 52 K's 'gundello' is modernized into 'gondola.'

The above are, of course, only a sampling to illustrate our charge.